

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

DR. JENNIFER LYNN GLASS, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

KEN PAXTON, et al.
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16cv845-LY

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSED MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**

Defendants respectfully move for an extension of time to respond to the Complaint, until 30 days after the Court's ruling on Plaintiffs' forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

1. The Complaint was served on Defendant Paxton on July 13, 2016; Defendant Fenves on July 12, 2016; and Defendants Foster, Jr., Hicks, Hildebrand, Aliseda, Beck, Cranberg, Hall, Jr., Pejovich, Tucker, and Joseph on July 11, 2016.
2. Accordingly, Defendants' responses to the Complaint are due on various dates: August 1, August 2, and August 3, 2016.
3. Defendants respectfully request that the Court set the deadline to respond to the Complaint on the same date for all Defendants, and that such date be 30 days after the Court rules on Plaintiffs' forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction.
4. The requested extension will conserve the resources of the parties and the Court, as it will avoid simultaneous briefing of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction and any dispositive motions that Defendants may file.

5. Moreover, the requested extension will allow the Court's resolution of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction to inform the briefing on any dispositive motions, making that briefing optimally useful to the Court.

6. The requested extension is further appropriate given the existing briefing schedule in this case. In order to accommodate Plaintiffs' desire for a ruling before August 24—despite Plaintiffs' failure to file a motion for preliminary injunction at the same time they filed their Complaint and their delay in filing suit generally—Defendants have agreed to an expedited schedule for briefing and hearing on Plaintiffs' forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

7. In light of that schedule, and Defendants' recentness to the issued presented compared to Plaintiffs, an extension is necessary to allow counsel for Defendants sufficient time to prepare responsive pleadings that are concise, thorough, and helpful to the Court in its ultimate resolution of this case.

Prayer

Defendants respectfully request that the Court extend their deadline to respond to the Complaint until 30 days after the Court rules on Plaintiffs' forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

DATED: JULY 20, 2016

Respectfully submitted.

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas

JEFFREY C. MATEER
First Assistant Attorney General

BRANTLEY STARR
Deputy First Assistant Attorney General

JAMES E. DAVIS
Deputy Attorney General for Civil Litigation

ANGELA V. COLMENERO
Chief, General Litigation Division

/s/ Amanda J. Cochran-McCall
AMANDA J. COCHRAN-MCCALL
Deputy Chief, General Litigation Division
Texas Bar No. 24069526

ANNE MARIE MACKIN
Assistant Attorney General
Texas Bar No. 24078898

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
GENERAL LITIGATION DIVISION
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711-2548
Tel.: (512) 463-2120
Fax: (512) 320-0667
amanda.cochran-mccall@texasattorneygeneral.gov

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS GREGORY L. FENVES,
PAUL L. FOSTER, R. STEVEN HICKS, JEFFERY
HILDEBRAND, ERNEST ALISEDA, DAVID J. BECK,
ALEX M. CRANBERG, WALLACE L. HALL, JR.,
BRENDA PEJOVICH, SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER, AND
VARUN P. JOSEPH

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas

JEFFREY C. MATEER
First Assistant Attorney General

BRANTLEY STARR
Deputy First Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Prerak Shah
PRERAK SHAH
Senior Counsel to the Attorney General
Texas Bar No. 24075053

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. Box 12548 (MC 001)
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
Tel.: (512) 936-1823
Fax: (512) 474-2697
prerak.shah@texasattorneygeneral.gov

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT KEN PAXTON

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I certify that counsel for the parties conferred in a good-faith attempt to resolve this request for an extension without Court intervention. Plaintiffs agreed to extend the deadline for all Defendants to respond to August 3, to allow all Defendants to respond on the same date. Plaintiffs were not, however, agreeable to any additional extension, rendering this motion necessary.

/s/ Prerak Shah
PRERAK SHAH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that this Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint was served on all counsel of record for all parties via the Court's CM/ECF filing system on July 20, 2016.

/s/ Prerak Shah
PRERAK SHAH